

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application based on the foregoing Amendment and the following Remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 13-16, 22, 37, 38, 40, 41, 46, 69, 72 and 77 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

At the outset, prior to addressing the prior art rejections, the applicants call to the Examiner's attention that claims 5, 6, 8, 13 and 72 have been rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

The applicants have cancelled claims 1-4, 7, 10-12, 17-19, 24-32, 59-62, 66, 71, 73, 74 and 80 without prejudice.

However, the applicants have not abandoned the subject matter of the cancelled claims and reserve the right to file a continuation application directed thereto.

The applicants have amended claims 20-23 and 67 to replace the phrase "expansion" with "expander". From FIG. 22 of the present application, transparent "expansion" 28 is formed on an end surface 39 of said optical conductor 38. Therefore, the intention is to expand, or magnify, the light. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the intention of the phrase "expansion" is "expander" and the preferred terminology is "expander". No new matter has been added.

No new matter has been added to the application by any of the foregoing amendments.

Applicants have attached hereto a marked-up version of the claims showing the amendments made thereto. It is entitled "Version With Markings to Show Changes Made."

Claim Objections: Claims 1-80

The Examiner objects to claims 1-80 because of the informality that the term "electroluminescence", which is a noun, is used to describe the "device", which the Examiner asserts is inappropriate. The Examiner contends that the noun "electroluminescence" should be replaced with --electroluminescent-- (an adjective). The Examiner is requiring correction.

In response, the applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's objection in that the applicant is permitted to be his own lexicographer as long as the terms defined by the applicant would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, it is not a grammatical requirement that a noun be modified solely by an adjective. It is very common in machinery to modify the machine by the product which it produces. An example of a second noun modified by a first noun which is the product produced is "vacuum cleaner". The second noun is a cleaning device which cleans by producing a vacuum, the first noun.

Therefore, the applicants maintain that the phrase "electroluminescence device" is an appropriate phrase meaning a device which produces electroluminescence. Consequently, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objections to claims 1-80.

References Cited

Due to the large number of references, i.e., 13 references, cited by the Examiner, the applicants have listed all of the cited references in the enclosed table, entitled "List of References Cited", in the order presented by the Examiner in the rejections over the prior art.

35 U.S.C. 102(b) Rejections: Claims 1,2, 4, 7, 10, 17-21, 59, 62, 66 and 67

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 17-21, 59, 62, 66 and 67 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 10-50124 (1).

In response, although the applicants disagree, claims 1-3, 7, 10, 17-19, 59, 62 and 66 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Regarding claim 20, and its analogous method claim 67, the Examiner indicates "further comprising a light permeable *expansion (11 or 31)* formed on the end surface (41, Fig. 4a) of the optical conductor, the EL device (19) being formed on the *expansion (11)* such that a dispersion angle of light emitted from EL device is reduced (compare Fig. 4a with Fig. 4b)."

The applicants note that the Examiner has not provided any direct arguments against claims 19 and 21. Claim 21, as amended, recites the lighting device as set forth in claim 20, wherein said electroluminescence device has a shape reflecting a shape of a surface of said *expander*.

As noted previously, the applicants have amended claims 20-23 and 67 to replace the word "expansion" with "expander".

From the "List of References Cited", claims 20, 21 and 67 are not rejected under any of the other references. Therefore, the applicants maintain with

respect to claims 20 and 67 that JP 10-50124 does not disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of a light permeable *expander* formed on an end surface of said optical conductor. Instead, JP 10-50124 discloses only a glass substrate 11 and an organic luminous layer structure 13 formed on a transparent electrode film 12.

As a result, claims 20-23 and 67 patentably distinguish over JP 10-50124. Consequently, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 20-21 and 67.

35 U.S.C. 102(b) Rejections: Claims 1, 2, 4, 24, 25, 33, 34, 36, 39, 42, 66 and 75

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 24, 25, 33, 34, 36, 39, 42, 66 and 75 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by BLONDER ET AL (US 6,036,327) (2)

Regarding claim 33, the Examiner only partially refers to claim 33 by indicating “wherein the EL device being at least partially embedded in the optical conductor (col. 5, lines 12-15), the EL inherently constituting at least one of plural layers embedded therein;”.

In response, the applicants note that claim 33 recites in part “said electroluminescence device being at least partially embedded in said optical conductor *such that at least one layer among layers constituting said electroluminescence device is embedded in said optical conductor.*”

From the “List of References Cited”, the applicants note also that claim 33 is rejected under TOKUNAGA (3), which is discussed next.

The applicants maintain that neither BLONDER nor TOKUNAGA, taken alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 33 of “at least one layer among layers constituting said electroluminescence device is embedded in said optical conductor.” Claims 34, 36, 39 and 42 stand together with claim 33.

Claim 75 is an independent method claim which recites the step of forming said electroluminescence device such that at least one layer among layers constituting said electroluminescence device is embedded in said optical layer. Therefore, the applicants maintain that claim 75 is analogous to claim 33 (and also to claim 63). As a result, neither BLONDER nor TOKUNAGA, taken alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 75.

The Examiner has not cited any specific arguments against claims 24 and 25. Claim 24 depends from claim 1. The Examiner does reject claims 24 and 25 under TOKUNAGA, as discussed below. Although BLONDER does not disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 25 of the lighting device as set forth in claim 24, wherein said recess is arcuate, the applicants have cancelled claims 24 and 25 without prejudice.

With regard to claims 1, 2, 4 and 66, although the applicants disagree, the applicants have cancelled those claims without prejudice.

Therefore, claims 33, 34, 36, 39, 42 and 75 patentably distinguish over BLONDER. Consequently, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 33, 34, 36, 39, 42 and 75.

35 U.S.C. 102(b) Rejections: Claims 1, 10, 24, 25, 33, 42, 66 and 71

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 10, 24, 25, 33, 42, 66 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by TOKUNAGA ET AL (US 5,375,043) (3)

In response, although the applicants disagree, the applicants have cancelled claims 1, 10, 24, 25, 66 and 71 without prejudice.

As noted above regarding BLONDER (2), the applicants maintain that TOKUNAGA does not disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 33. Claim 42 stands together with claim 33.

Consequently, claims 33 and 42 patentably distinguish over BLONDER. As a result, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 33 and 42.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claims 3, 28, 29, 32, 68 and 70

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 28, 29, 32, 68 and 70 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 10-50124 (1) in view of SCHONIGER ET AL (US 5,027,258) (4).

In response, although the applicants disagree, the applicants have cancelled claims 3, 28, 29 and 32 without prejudice.

Regarding claims 68 and 70, both of which depend from claim 67, the applicants maintain that neither JP 10-50124(1) nor SCHONIGER ET AL (4), taken alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 67

of a light-permeable expander formed on said end surface of said optical conductor, said electroluminescence device formed on said expander.

Therefore, claims 68 and 70 patentably distinguish over JP 10-50124 (1) and SCHONIGER ET AL (4).

Consequently, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 68 and 70.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claims 11, 12 and 23

The Examiner has rejected claims 11, 12 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 10-50124 (1) in view of CODAMA ET AL (US 6,121,726) (5).

In response, although the applicants disagree, the applicants have cancelled claims 11 and 12 without prejudice.

With respect to claim 23, which depends from claim 20, the applicants maintain that neither JP 10-50124 (1) nor CODAMA ET AL (5), taken alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 23, as amended, of “*said **expander** has an index of refraction greater than indices of refraction of said hole-injecting layer, said light-emitting layer and said electron-transporting layer*”. Neither (1) nor (5) teach or suggest an expander, nor an expander having an index of refraction greater than indices of refraction of said layers.

Consequently, claim 23 patentably distinguishes over JP 10-50124 (1) in view of CODAMA ET AL (5). As a result, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 23.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claims 26 and 27

The Examiner has rejected claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 10-50124 (1) in view of TIAO ET AL (US 6,254,246) (6).

In response, although the applicants disagree, the applicants have cancelled claims 26 and 27 without prejudice.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claims 28-32

The Examiner has rejected claims 28-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 10-50124 (1) in view of INOHARA ET AL (US 4,357,557) (7).

In response, although the applicants disagree, the applicants have cancelled claims 28-32 without prejudice.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claims 35 and 73

The Examiner has rejected claims 35 and 73 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over TOKUNAGA (3) in view of SCHONIGER ET AL (US 4,903,172) (8).

Claim 35 depends from claim 33. Claim 73 depends from claim 66.

In response, regarding claim 35, the applicants maintain that TOKUNAGA (3) in view of SCHONIGER ET AL (US 4,903,172) (8) does not overcome the deficiencies of BLONDER ET AL with respect to claim 33. Therefore, claim 35 patentably distinguishes over TOKUNAGA (3) in view of

SCHONIGER ET AL ('172) (8). As a result, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 35.

Although the applicants disagree, the applicants have cancelled claim 73 without prejudice.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claims 43-45 and 47-49

The Examiner has rejected claims 43-45 and 47-49 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BLONDER ET AL (2) in view of CODAMA ET AL (US 6,121,726) (5).

Claim 43 depends directly from claim 33. Claim 47 depends from claim 45, which depends from intervening claim 44, which in turn depends from claim 33. The Examiner presents the same arguments cited against claims 11 and 12, i.e., by asserting that CODAMA ET AL disclose a transport electrode layer (22), a hole-injecting layer (23), a light-emitting layer (25), an electron-transporting layer (26), and a metal electrode layer (27).

Therefore, the applicants maintain that claims 43-45 and 47-49 patentably distinguish over BLONDER ET AL (2) in view of CODAMA ET AL (5) in that CODAMA ET AL does not overcome the deficiencies of BLONDER ET AL with respect to claim 33.

Consequently, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 43-45 and 47-49.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claims 50, 51, 63 and 65

The Examiner has rejected claims 50, 51, 63 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BLONDER ET AL (2) in view of JP 10-50124 (1).

Claim 50 depends from claim 33. Claim 51 depends from claim 50. Claim 63 is an independent apparatus claim which is analogous to claim 33, and recites the same limitation of “at least one layer among layers constituting said electroluminescence device is embedded in said optical conductor”. Claim 65 depends from claim 63.

In response, in that JP 10-50124 does not overcome the deficiencies of BLONDER ET AL with respect to claim 33, which recites “at least one layer among layers constituting said electroluminescence device is embedded in said optical conductor”, the applicants maintain that claims 50, 51, 63 and 65 patentably distinguish over BLONDER ET AL (2) in view of JP 10-50124 (1).

Consequently, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 50, 51, 63 and 65.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claims 52, 53 and 74

The Examiner has rejected claims 52, 53 and 74 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BLONDER ET AL (2) in view of TIAO ET AL (6).

Claims 52 and 53 are analogous to claim 26 and 27, which the Examiner has rejected, as discussed previously, as being unpatentable over JP 10-50124 (1) in view of TIAO ET AL (6).

However, claim 52 depends from claim 33. Therefore, in that TIAO ET AL does not overcome the deficiencies of BLONDER ET AL with respect to claim 33, the applicants maintain that claims 52 and 53 patentably distinguish over BLONDER ET AL (2) in view of TIAO ET AL (6).

As a result, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 52 and 53.

With regard to claim 74, although the applicants disagree, the applicants have cancelled claim 74 without prejudice.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claims 54-58

The Examiner has rejected claims 54-58 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BLONDER ET AL (2) in view of INOHARA ET AL (7).

Claims 54-58 are analogous to claims 28-32, which generally recite hermetic sealing and deoxidizing and dehydrating.

Claims 54 and 55 each depend from claim 33. Therefore, the applicants maintain that claims 54-58 patentably distinguish over the references in that INOHARA ET AL does not overcome the deficiencies of BLONDER ET AL with respect to claim 33. Consequently, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 54-58.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claim 60

The Examiner has rejected claim 60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 10-50124 (1) in view of MAEDA ET AL (US 6,285,422) (9).

Claim 60 recites the liquid crystal display device as set forth in claim 59, further comprising a *half-mirror located between said first substrate and said optical conductor*.

The Examiner asserts that MAEDA ET AL, Fig. 22, discloses a half-mirror 220 between a substrate (16) associated with an LCD (10, Fig. 1) and an optical conductor of a lighting device 17, Figs. 1 and 22).

In response, the applicants maintain that 16 in MAEDA ET AL is not a substrate but instead is a polarized light separator, as disclosed in column 29, lines 24-25. Therefore, **neither** JP 10-50124 (1) nor MAEDA ET AL (9) disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 60 of a half-mirror located between first and second substrates, as recited by claim 60.

As a result, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 60.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claim 61

The Examiner has rejected claim 61 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 10-50124 (1) in view of TAI ET AL (US 5,608,837) (10).

In response, although the applicants disagree, the applicants have cancelled claim 61 without prejudice.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claim 64

The Examiner has rejected claim 64 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BLONDER ET AL (2) in view of TAI ET AL (US 5,608,837) (10).

Claim 64 depends from claim 63, and generally recites a brightness detector and a controller which turns the lighting device on and off according to the brightness detected by the detector.

In response, the applicants maintain that claim 64 patentably distinguishes over BLONDER ET AL (2) in view of TAI ET AL (US 5,608,837) (10) in that TAI ET AL does not overcome the deficiencies of BLONDER ET AL (2) or JP 10-50124 (1) with respect to claim 63. As a result, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 64.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claims 75 and 76

The Examiner has rejected claims 75 and 76 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over TOKUNAGA (3) in view of JONES ET AL (US 6,198,220) (11).

Claim 75 recites a method of fabricating a lighting device including an electroluminescence device which acts as a light source, and an optical conductor which introduces a light emitted from said electroluminescence device, to a liquid crystal display device, comprising the step of (a) *forming said electroluminescence device such that at least one layer among layers constituting said electroluminescence device is embedded in said optical conductor.*

Therefore, claim 75 is analogous to claims 33 and 63, discussed previously. The Examiner asserts that JONES ET AL, FIG. 1, teaches plural layers that constitute an EL or LED device (100) for the purpose of defining an operative illuminating device.

In response, the applicants note that in JONES ET AL, FIG. 1, the sealed organic LED display 100 comprises a metal film 175, a dielectric film 150, a cathode 900 and an anode 400 between which organic LED 10 is positioned, and a substrate 200. The applicants maintain that JONES ET AL does not disclose “*at least one layer among layers constituting the electroluminescence device is embedded in said optical conductor*”.

Claim 76 depends from claim 75, and generally recites that the EL device is formed in a recess. Therefore, neither TOKUNAGA (3) nor JONES ET AL (11), taken alone or in combination. Discloses, teaches or suggests the limitations of claims 75 and 76. As a result, claims 75 and 76 patentably distinguish over TOKUNAGA (3) in view of JONES ET AL (11). Consequently, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 75 and 76.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claim 78

The Examiner has rejected claim 78 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over TOKUNAGA (3) in view of JONES ET AL (US 6,198,220) (11), as applied to claims 75 and 76, and further in view of SCHONIGER ET AL ‘172 (8).

Claim 78 depends from claim 75. The Examiner presents the same arguments as cited against claims 35 and 73 regarding forming a reflector covering the end surface of the optical conductor to prevent light from leaking out of the end surface.

In response, the applicants maintain that claim 78 patentably distinguishes over TOKUNAGA (3) in view of JONES ET AL (11), as applied to claims 75 and 76, and further in view of SCHONIGER ET AL '172 (8) in that SCHONIGER ET AL '172 (8) does not overcome the deficiencies of TOKUNAGA (3) in view of JONES ET AL (11) with respect to claim 75. Consequently, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 78.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claim 79

The Examiner has rejected claim 79 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over TOKUNAGA (3) in view of JONES ET AL (US 6,198,220) (11), as applied to claims 75 and 76, and further in view of TIAO ET AL (6).

Claim 79 also depends from claim 75. The Examiner presents the same arguments cited against claims 26 and 27 regarding tapering of the optical conductor at at least one of upper and lower surfaces.

In response, the applicants maintain that claim 78 patentably distinguishes over TOKUNAGA (3) in view of JONES ET AL (11), as applied to claims 75 and 76, and further in view of TIAO ET AL (6) in that TIAO ET AL (6) does not overcome the deficiencies of TOKUNAGA (3) in view of JONES ET AL (11) with respect to claim 75. Consequently, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 79.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claim 80

The Examiner has rejected claim 80 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over YAMADA ET AL (US 5,704,703) (12) in view of KUSAFUKA ET AL (US 6,250,767) (13).

Claim 80 is an independent method claim comprising the steps of (a) stacking a plurality of optical conductors one on another; (b) forming the electroluminescence device on an end surface of each of the optical conductors; and (c) separating the optical conductors into pieces.

In response, although the applicants disagree, the applicants have cancelled claim 80 without prejudice.

The foregoing Amendment and Remarks establish the patentable nature of all of the claims remaining in the application, i.e., claims 5, 6, 8, 9 13-16, 20-23, 33-58, 63-65, 67-70, 72 and 75-79. No new matter has been added. Wherefore, early and favorable reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony N. Fresco
Registration No. 45,784

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
516-742-4343/4366 FAX

ANF:yd

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

In the Claims:

Claims 1-4, 7, 10-12, 17-19, 24-32, 59-62, 66, 71, 73, 74 and 80 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 5 has been amended as follows:

5. (Amended) [The lighting device as set forth in claim 4, wherein]

A lighting device comprising:

(a) an electroluminescence device which acts as a light source; and

(b) an optical conductor which introduces a light emitted from said electroluminescence device, to a liquid crystal display device,

said electroluminescence device being formed on an end surface of said optical conductor,

said electroluminescence device is comprised of a plurality of electroluminescence device groups each including a plurality of sub-devices emitting lights having different wavelengths from one another, and

said electroluminescence device groups are periodically repeatedly arranged in a direction in which sub-devices are arranged.

Claim 6 has been amended as follows:

6. (Amended) [The lighting device as set forth in claim 4, wherein]

A lighting device comprising:

(a) an electroluminescence device which acts as a light source; and

(b) an optical conductor which introduces a light emitted from said electroluminescence device, to a liquid crystal display device,

said electroluminescence device being formed on an end surface of said optical conductor,

said electroluminescence device is comprised of a plurality of

electroluminescence device groups each including a plurality of sub-devices emitting lights having different wavelengths from one another, and

said electroluminescence device groups are periodically repeatedly arranged in a direction perpendicular to a direction in which sub-devices are arranged.

Claim 8 has been amended as follows:

8. (Amended) [The lighting device as set forth in claim 4, further comprising]

A lighting device comprising:

(a) an electroluminescence device which acts as a light source; and

(b) an optical conductor which introduces a light emitted from said electroluminescence device, to a liquid crystal display device,

said electroluminescence device being formed on an end surface of said optical conductor,

said electroluminescence device is comprised of a plurality of electroluminescence device groups each including a plurality of sub-devices emitting lights having different wavelengths from one another, and

partitions between which said sub-devices are arranged or which at least partially surrounds said sub-devices.

Claim 13 has been amended as follows:

13. (Amended) [The lighting device as set forth in claim 12, wherein]

A lighting device comprising:

(a) an electroluminescence device which acts as a light source; and

(b) an optical conductor which introduces a light, emitted from said electroluminescence device, to a liquid crystal display device,

said electroluminescence device being formed on an end surface of said optical conductor,

said electroluminescence device is comprised of a plurality of electroluminescence device groups each including a plurality of sub-devices emitting lights having different wavelengths from one another,

said electroluminescence device has a multi-layered structure including a transparent electrode layer, a hole-injecting layer, a light-emitting layer, an electron-transporting layer, and a metal electrode layer stacked in this order as viewed from said optical conductor and

at least one of said metal electrode layer, said electron-transporting layer, said hole-injecting layer and said transparent electrode layer is formed across said sub-devices such that each of said sub-devices commonly includes said at least one of said metal electrode layer, said electron-transporting layer, said hole-injecting layer and said transparent electrode layer.

Claim 20 has been amended as follows:

20. (Amended) The lighting device as set forth in claim 1, further comprising a light-permeable [expansion] expander formed on said end surface of said optical conductor,

said electroluminescence device being formed on said [expansion] expander such that a dispersion angle of a light emitted from said electroluminescence device is reduced.

Claim 21 has been amended as follows:

21. (Amended) The lighting device as set forth in claim 20, wherein said electroluminescence device has a shape reflecting a shape of a surface of said [expansion] expander.

Claim 22 has been amended as follows:

22. (Amended) The lighting device as set forth in claim 21, wherein said [expansion] expander has an arcuate surface.

Claim 23 has been amended as follows:

23. (Amended) The lighting device as set forth in claim 20, wherein said electroluminescence device is comprised of a transparent electrode layer, a hole-injecting layer, a light-emitting layer, an electron transporting layer and a metal electrode layer stacked in this order as viewing from said optical conductor, and wherein

said [expansion] expander has an index of refraction greater than indices of refraction of said hole-injecting layer, said light-emitting layer and said electron-transporting layer.

Claim 67 has been amended as follows:

67. (Amended) The method as set forth in claim 66, further comprising the step of (b) forming a light-permeable [expansion] expander on said end surface of said optical conductor, said electroluminescence device being formed on said [expansion] expander.

Claim 72 has been amended as follows:

72. (Amended) [The method as set forth in claim 66, further comprising the steps of:]

A method of fabricating a lighting device including an electroluminescence device which acts as a light source, and an optical conductor which introduces a light emitted from said electroluminescence device, to a liquid crystal display device, comprising the steps of:

(a) forming said electroluminescence device on an end surface of

said optical conductor,

(b) forming a wiring pattern on said end surface of said optical conductor; and

(c) electrically connecting a transparent electrode and a metal electrode of said electroluminescence device to said wiring pattern through an electrical conductor.

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED

Item No.	Identification No.	Inventor Names	Filing Date	Publication Date	Type of Rejection	Claims
1	JP 10-50124			1998/02/20	102(b)	1,2, 4, 7, 10, 17-21, 59, 62, 66 and 67
2	US 6,036,327	Blonder et al	1998/04/21	2000/03/14	102(b)	1, 2, 4, 24, 25, 33, 34, 36, 39, 42, 66 and 75
					103(a) (2) and (5)	43-45 and 47-49
					103(a) (2) and (1)	50, 51, 63 and 65
					103(a) (2) and (6)	52, 53 and 74
					103(a) (2) and (7)	54-58
					103(a) (2) and (10)	64
3	US 5,375,043	Tokunaga	1993/07/06	1994/12/20	102(b)	1, 10, 24, 25, 33, 42, 66 and 71
					103(a) (3) and (8)	35 and 73
4	US 5,027,258	Schoniger et al	1990/05/04	1991/05/25	103(a) (1) and (4)	3, 28, 29, 32, 68 and 70
5	US 6,121,726	Codama et al	1997/12/16	2000/09/19	103(a) (1) and (5)	11, 12 and 23

6	US 6,254,246 B1	Tiao et al	1999/10/01	2001/07/03	103(a) (1) and (6)	26 and 27
					103(a) (3), (11) and (6)	79
7	US 4,357,557	Inohara et al	1980/03/14	1982/11/02	103(a) (1) and (7)	28-32
8	US 4,903,172	Schoniger et al	1988/09/12	1990/02/20	103(a) (3) and (8)	35 and 73
					103(a) (3), (11) and (8)	78
9	US 6,285,422 B1	Maeda et al	1998/05/14	2001/09/04	103(a) (1) and (9)	60
10	US 5,608,837	Tai et al	1995/05/15	1997/03/04	103(a) (1) and (10)	61
11	US 6,198,220 B1	Jones et al	1998/05/08	2001/03/06	103(a) (3) and (11)	75 and 76
12	US 5,704,703	Yamada et al	1997/03/13	1998/01/06	103(a) (12) and (13)	80
13	US 6,250,767	Kusafuka et al	1999/06/16	2001/06/26	103(a) (12) and (13)	80